

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

Dated this the 3rd day of April, 1998

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE R V RAVEENDRAN

Writ Petition No 11344-49 of 1998

Between:

1. H R Venkataramayya  
s/o Rangappa  
Age 53 years  
r/o 11/94, Model  
House Street  
Basavangudi  
Bangalore-4
2. T. S Shivananda  
s/o Late Shivarudrappa  
age 43 years  
r/o No 16, New  
Byatarayanapura  
Near Mysore Road  
Bangalore-26
3. M S Venugopal  
s/o Late M Y Shamanna  
Age 48 years  
r/o No 2259, LIG  
III Stage, Yelahanka  
New Town  
Bangalore-64
4. Kempegowda  
s/o Late Panchalingegowda  
Age 46 years  
r/o No 3702, 7th Cross  
'B' Block  
Gayathrinagar  
Bangalore-21

was

496

5. A M Prakash  
s/o Mahadevegowda  
r/o Anekal, Behind  
KEB Office,  
Bangalore dist
6. A Rajanna  
s/o Atmaramayya  
age 44 years  
r/o 246, 'Pragati  
Nilaya', Amarjyothi  
Road, Vinayakanagar  
Bangalore-36

... PETITIONERS

[By Sri B S Hadimani, Adv]

And:

1. The Managing Director  
KSRTC, Central Offices  
K H Road, Bangalore-27
2. The Divisional Controller  
KSRTC, Central Offices  
K H Road, Bangalore-27

... RESPONDENTS

\*\*\*\*\*

Writ Petition is filed praying to quash Annexure 'B' dated 13-3-1998 passed respondent No 2 in so far as the petitioners are concerned.

This writ petition coming on for preliminary hearing this day, the Court made the following:-

### ORDER

The petitioners claim that they were appointed as conductors in KSRTC. For several years, they are working in the reservation counter for booking tickets. According to petitioners, it

Rmk

uaf

is decades since they have been on line duty as conductor. In fact, the petitioners claim that they have also been given training in computer operation for the purpose of booking tickets.

2. When matters stood thus, suddenly, the second respondent has issued the impugned order 13-3-1998 [Annexure 'B'] transferring them to work in several depots as on line conductors. The petitioners are aggrieved. According to them, they have been working in booking counters for more than twenty years and are virtually at the fag end of their services and they should not be posted to work as conductors on line. Hence, they have filed these petitions and sought quashing of Annexure 'B'.

3. The fact that the petitioners are appointed as conductors and are <sup>in the</sup> cadres <sup>of</sup> as conductors is not in dispute. The challenge is to the order of transfer assigning them their normal duties as conductors. It may be true that they have been working not as conductors, but as reservation counter clerks for several years <sup>and, it</sup> ~~it~~ would be more appropriate to continue them accordingly,

RMR

498

particularly if they had got computer training. But this is a matter which will have to be considered by the employer, and is not a matter where the courts will interfere. It is open to the petitioners to give a representation bringing to the notice of the second respondent the relevant facts as set out in the petition with a request to continue them in their present posts. If and when such representation is given, I am sure the same will be considered sympathetically in the factual background. No ground is made out to interfere with Annexure 'B'. The petitions are accordingly rejected.

Sd/-  
JUDGE

